

Town of Primrose Comprehensive Planning Steering Committee Minutes for August 17, 2009.

Attending: Dein, Elkins, Garfoot, Gibson, Haack, Hayward, J. Judd, and D. Judd
Meeting called to order at 7:40 by Dein

1. Motion to approve the minutes of June 29 made by Hayward, seconded by Garfoot. Motion carried 6-0
2. Discussion with and presentation by Brian Standing regarding the Land Use element of the comprehensive Plan.
 - (a) Standing presented information he had collected about the number of houses that would be added by substandard parcels and farmhouses. People thought those numbers were inaccurate. He was going to check with the Town Clerk and compare her numbers. He said that in regards to substandard parcels and farmhouses, our Land Use Plan was less restrictive than some, but in regard to the disturbance of ag. land for building our Plan was more restrictive than some other Townships. He suggested that perhaps a balance between could be achieved by being more restrictive with substandard parcels and farmhouses, but less restrictive on disturbing small amounts of ag. land.
 - (b) Standing presented maps showing hydric soils, wetlands, steep slopes, floodplains and woodland in the Township.
 - (c) Public comment:
 - Take woodlands and pastures out of ERP.
 - Get count of farmhouses on A-1(ex) > 35 acres from Winnie.
 - Look at 1981 vs. 2000 agricultural use.
 - look at contiguous vs. noncontiguous acres in original ownership. Plan currently says noncontiguous.
 - Look at properties that are separated from the road, if they were charged two density units for crossing productive farm soils and history of agricultural use.
 - Consider phasing requirements for splits. Total caps per year.
 - Send splits map in Google Earth format to Josh.
 - Chapter 8, Page 4 change Door Creek to Deer Creek
 - Consider using 1981 tax rolls for original farm ownership boundaries.
 - Farm residences and substandard parcels may be as high as 100.
 - Look at Planning Commission's 2005 recommendations.
 - Modify density standards.
 - Discussion of number of builds per year.
 - Discussion of Farms with two houses. Secondary farm residences.
 - Count all houses in 1981 / all homes in A-1(ex).
 - Retirement homes for farmers?
 - Consider different starting date for new policies, especially if you are going to change how contiguous / noncontiguous farms or allocation of splits.
 - Is 1981 the appropriate baseline date to use?

--Coordination of TDR with other towns
--How will Working Lands Initiative affect
Public Comment closed.

(d) Discussion among Steering Committee Members.

(i) Comments made

--Garfoot said that he thought we should consider adding a layer to our current Land Use Plan for those that had no building sites but did have density units. This layer would add an exception for such land-owners allowing them to cross agricultural land in order to reach builds. His proposal had the following features. (i) density would be increased to one house per 70 acres, when agricultural land was crossed to reach a building site. (b) There would be siting criteria put in place to minimize the impact on the land and adjoining properties, and (c) all of the remaining land (remaining after the 2 or 4 acre building site) would be deed restricted.

--J. Judd thought that we should relax the rules regarding no driveways crossing ag. land and instead put a cap on how many houses could be built a year and how often a land-owner could develop a building site.

--Gibson said that the majority of people in the survey wanted slow growth, and more people wanted less growth than wanted more growth. Given the survey, it is problematic to relax the criteria to allow more building by letting people cross and build in ag. land. If we want to distribute the builds more fairly, we should see how many builds there could be under the current Plan, and then set density at a level that would allow that many or perhaps a slightly higher number of builds, and allow everyone then to have their builds at that density level regardless of what kind of land they have. That would make the Plan fair, without increasing the number of builds there would be in the long run.

--Dein agreed with Garfoot that any change must be accompanied with siting criteria, and thought that we should try to identify criteria for a buildable site.

--Several members said that they did not oppose building caps but that was not a total solution. There would have to be siting criteria and some mechanism for restricting the total number of builds in the long run.

(ii) Discussion of what changes or language of Standing's we wanted to accept in the Draft, and what needed further discussion.

Items for future discussion: proportional allocation, transfer of development rights within the Township, transfer of development rights outside of the Township, substandard parcels, farmhouses, density policy.

We decided we did want to stay with our current policy and not round up regarding density units, and so accept the language regarding rounding in the draft. We also do want to go to A-4 zoning and deed restrictions when splits are exhausted.

3. Next meeting was set for August 21.

4. Motion to adjourn made by Gibson, seconded by Hayward. Motion carried 7-0

Minutes respectfully submitted by Martha Gibson